



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ANTI-UNION.

PRICE 2D.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1799.

No. XVIII.

ADVICE.

TO

YOUNG MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

AS many of you have not yet had time to take your seats, since the dismissal of your predecessors on the question of an Union, it occurred to me that I could not better employ myself, *now that the nation has nothing to agitate or distract it*, than by giving you some instructions as to your conduct both in and out of the House. The rules I shall lay down are simple and easy; and are such as I have uniformly followed myself, with what success, you can judge. And first, as to your *entrée* into the House: Be particular who the members are that introduce you; they are your political sponsors, that must answer for your future faith; "Tell me whom you live with, and I will tell you what you are," is an adage as true as it is common. The first impression of your virtue and abilities, will be received from your early companions; and first impressions are seldom effaced. Be careful, therefore, that they are men whose versatility of mind, and accommodating dispositions, qualify them to fill every situation, from the highest, to the very lowest. You will thus get credit for promising to be a very *useful* character.

On your first introduction, it will be necessary to bow to the chair. As *manner* often supplies the place of *matter*, this ought to be done with a grace. It will be the more necessary, as no doubt you are disposed to follow Sir Archy Mac Sarcasm's excellent advice, "still to keep bowing," and "never to stand upright in the presence of a great man." It will be proper, therefore, to take some lessons from a dancing master; especially if you have never learnt before. Not that I should wish you to study the *science* profoundly. As far as it will be useful to you in your present situation, you will acquire it by degrees; the attendance, for instance, which you will dance at the Castle, must be done in a *sink* pace, which you will naturally fall into; and as to the common movements of *cross over*, *change sides*, &c. you will have an opportunity of seeing these done with astonishing celerity and ease, (not to *trench* upon the merits of any other professor) by one of the first masters. Should you be an admirer of *French steps*, the Secretary will soon teach you a few. He lately astonished every body by his *contretems*, and he will shortly, it is expected, shew you a *chassé*, in an elegant *pas de deux*, which

he is expected to perform along with his friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to the great delight of all spectators.

When you have taken the oaths, and are completely installed in your office, do not look around like a booby, as if at a loss where to place yourself. Nothing gives a meaner opinion of a man's understanding, than a wavering, undecided conduct. Determine, therefore, at once; and having done so, *invariably* adhere to that determination. By thus evincing that you come into Parliament to act, and not to deliberate, and that you have already made up your mind upon every subject which can by possibility arise, you will convince the world of the great range of your understanding, and secure yourself from all imputation of improper motives, which occasionally changing sides might give rise to. In point of accommodation, there is little difference between the sides of the House. The right hand being always the most worthy, the Bench on the right of the chair, is, (if you look for honors) the most honorable. Besides it is probable you will be less crowded there. It is true, this will bring you into contact with his Majesty's Ministers, who *generally* sit on that Bench; this, however, when fairly considered, is not so great an objection, as might at first appear; for tho' it is an old and a true saying, "if you handle dirt you will soil your fingers," yet still they are his Majesty's confidential servants, and "love me, love my dog," (to say nothing of the *bone* which that dog has in his mouth) a saying no less estimable.

Both in and out of the House, be careful to convince the world by your manner, that you always bear in mind the high situation you fill—that you are aware of the great purpose for which you were appointed—that you can account for the necessity of such an appointment—and that you are fully sensible of the particular reasons why *you*, of all others, should be pitched on for the important office—evince your consciousness, therefore, that you are a member of the highest assembly in the nation—that you are appointed not only to *act*, but to *think*, for the people—that the necessity of such an appointment arises from the *utter incapacity* of the people to *act* or *think* for themselves—and that you were chosen, because in you are concentrated all the talents, wisdom, and virtue, of the district you profess to represent. Be careful on all occasions to manifest the high sense you have of your own intellectual powers—besides the imposing air of sublimity this will give to your whole demeanour, it will pay a flattering compliment to those who appointed you, by convincing them that in your sincere opinion, they displayed great good sense and discrimination in the choice.

Never take advice, especially from those who, in vulgar language, are called your constituents; not even where their individual interests are exclusively concerned, or where the subject falls peculiarly within their knowledge. To receive advice, is to acknowledge that you can possibly stand in need of instruction, and that there is some information which you are yet to acquire. Nothing can be more derogatory from your dignity than this, even where you cannot be expected to know much; and indeed the less you are expected to know, the higher opinion will be entertained of the knowledge you possess, which will then be looked upon as intuitive—besides, nothing convinces a man's spirit more than his acting in direct opposition to the line of his duty, especially when that duty is suggested by those who may claim a right to advise.

The power of parliament has, within these few days, become almost proverbial—all things are, at present, possible to it; you must therefore stoutly maintain the omnipotence of parliament on all proper occasions—I say on all proper occasions, for it is a two-edged weapon, which requires to be handled with dexterity—and here I must caution you against falling into a mistake natural to young men without a knowledge of the world. The “omnipotence,” the “wisdom,” the “virtue,” the “independence,” and such like of parliament, are not to be received by you absolutely, and without qualification; on the contrary, as a late learned judge once observed, when endeavouring to reconcile a suitor in his court to the names—“rogue, rascal and knave,” which had been liberally dealt out to him by counsel on the opposite side: “These terms are only to be understood *secundam subjectam materiam*.” For instance, should any measure of reform be introduced, such as a bill for excluding revenue officers from parliament, deny the competency of parliament to make laws which would exclude any particular individuals from the House of Commons, and partially disfranchise their constituents, by fettering that choice which ought to be free; maintain too, on such occasions, the great virtue, the proud spirit, the exalted sense of independence of parliament, which render such a measure unnecessary; express your detestation of that man who would dare with sacrilegious hands to touch a stone of that venerable pile, under whose shelter “this nation has experienced unexampled prosperity,” and that too at a season when the best constructed governments in Europe have fallen before the fury of a hurricane; but should it be attempted not partially, but locally, to disfranchise the electors of Ireland, not merely to fetter their choice, but to deprive them of all choice; not to reform the parliament, but to extinguish it for ever; not to modify the legislature, but to surrender the legislation to the crown, or to transfer it to a foreign nation, and this not merely without the assent, but against the will of the people; then maintain the omnipotence of parliament in all its plenitude, villify its past conduct, blazon its corruption, and laugh at its independence; and whilst you

maintain the incapacity of the nation to manage its own internal concerns, insist on the prudence and propriety of transferring the right to strangers, who, being indifferent to its interests, can discuss them with more coolness, nor dread the imputation of inconsistency in maintaining that that assembly which is inadequate to the common purposes of internal regulation, is competent to determine the greatest of all possible imperial questions; or that that body which is so dependant and so corrupt as to render it imprudent and unsafe to intrust it with the power of legislating for Ireland, should yet be invested with the right to transfer that power to others, and intrusted to adjust the terms of the transfer with that nation on which it is so dependent, and by which it has been so corrupted. These little inconsistencies are among those eccentricities of mind which distinguish the man of genius from the practical plodder, who never sees an object without noting all its bearings and distances.

Should you be of the profession of the Bar, you will not want frequent opportunities of distinguishing yourself; at no period did great constitutional questions occur so frequently, and on those you will be expected and prepared to speak—the more repugnant the side you maintain is to common vulgar ideas of liberty, or the constitution, the finer field will you have for the exercise of your ingenuity; and whatever effects your eloquence may have on others, it will, at least, convince your party that you will go any length to serve them; for which, no doubt, they will shew their gratitude. Be sure on these occasions always to begin your speech by saying something of yourself, it is a subject in which the world must be deeply interested—describe your situation in life as independent—assert the utmost purity of motives, and profess to speak the honest dictates of an unbiassed conscience; this will convince your party that you have prudence enough to keep their secret and your own. Should your past conduct, or present situation be such that ordinary assertions of independence will not be attended to, I have no objection to an appeal to heaven, provided it be made in a solemn and impressive manner. These little rhetorical flourishes are very allowable, and have often a pretty effect in a speech which would otherwise contain nothing to excite or keep up attention, and therefore they ought to be introduced when the yawning of those about you, or the coughing on the other side, proclaim *ennui*, or disgust.

When any measure is attempted by your party, destructive of the rights of the people, endeavour to find a precedent for it, in the proceedings either of our own, or of some foreign parliament—no matter if you should have to go so far back as the reign of Edward 3. in search of it. There is nothing so consolatory to a suffering mind as the reflections that others have suffered before by the same means, and as the parliaments of this and the neighbouring kingdoms have passed through every intermediate stage between the most abject servili-

ty, and their present plenitude of power, it cannot be difficult to find such a precedent in favour of *any* measure. If, for instance, a legislative incorporation of the two kingdoms should be before the house, the Scotch Union in 1707 presents an example worthy to be followed by an Irish parliament in 1799. Let not the difference in the constitutions of the two kingdoms shock, as it might, your understanding: a parliament is a parliament all the world over, no matter how constituted or of whom composed, nor let the time, the place, the situation of the country, or any such trifling circumstance, induce you to withhold so excellent a precedent. "Expedient" and "prudent" are abstract terms, which have no relation to existing circumstances, and therefore, what is expedient and precedent at *one* time, in *one* place, or in *one* situation, must be so in *all*. Neither let the manner in which the Scotch Union was affected, viz. by fraud and force, weigh with you—the precedent may not be the less in point on that account. To this you may add the authority of great constitutional writers: I must caution you, however, that this is dangerous ground to go on, for unless they are garbled with judgment, they may make against you. Sir Wm. Blackstone has been often quoted, and with prudent management may be made something of; for instance, when in vol. 1st, page 162, he says, "*So long as the constitution lasts we may venture to affirm that the power of parliament is absolute and without controul.*" You have only to omit the words, "*so long as the constitution lasts,*" which could seem to insinuate that the power of parliament must determine with the constitution on which it depends, and reject the words "*we may venture to affirm,*" which, imply a doubt, and then you will have the sentence thus—"the power of parliament is absolute and without controul," which will completely serve your purpose. Some I know may be inclined to adduce as an authority the revolution in 1688, but I am utterly against the most distant allusion to that great event. In the first place, the word "*revolution*" would shock loyal minds, and then it would be argued, (for there are always men inclined to put every thing in the worst light) that if you admit that to have been a revolution which did not alter the constitution in a single tittle, but merely changed the person exercising one of the branches of it, by what name will you call an act which causes the total destruction of the other two? Besides James was de-throned for "*having endeavoured to subvert the constitution by breaking the original contract*" made with the people. He was deposed by the *nation*—for after he had abdicated the government, there was then no parliament—and therefore, Sir Wm. Blackstone says, vol. 1st, page 211, that "*it was the act of the nation alone,*" for, says he, page 212, "*whenever a question arises between the society at large, and any magistrate vested with powers originally delegated by that society, it must be decided by the society itself.*" Add to this, that many might be induced to look into the English commons' journals about that time, in which the principles of Locke are

made the foundation of their proceedings; principles which they might be disposed to think were expressly confined by the act of settlement, and of which they might consider every act of parliament made since as containing a virtual recognition. I would, therefore, by all means, have you to avoid so dangerous a subject with respect to arguments drawn from the conduct of *individuals*, I do not think much of them. People seem tired of hearing of Lord Somers both in and out of the house; they are not inclined to pin their political faith on any one man's sleeve; and am I much afraid they do not see the analogy as clearly as they ought, between an *Englishman* endeavouring to *exalt his own country*, and an *Irishman* contriving to *debase his*. Besides this would introduce a spirit of argument, which may prove by no means favourable, viz. the inferring the nature of the act from the character of the actor; and therefore, when it is asked, "*would Lord Somers have prepared the articles of Union if he had not thought it a constitutional act?*" The opposite party may ask, "*would Pitt have the Union with Ireland so much at heart if he did not think it would contribute to his own aggrandizement, and open a source of revenue—would the English nation desire it if they did not think they would gain by the change?*" But there is one line of argument which I recommend, as it has never been taken yet: many have adopted old prejudices which they have not yet been able to get rid of, such as, that parliament is an emanation from the people—that its power is a mere delegated trust, which it must exercise upon the terms on which it was given, and for the benefit of those by whom, and for whom it was so given—that to give parliament a right of destroying any branch of the constitution, a right which it denies to the people themselves, is to render the creature more powerful than the creator. Now, as they are in general very good sort of people who entertain these absurd notions, and whose feelings one would not wish to revolt; when these things are advanced, do not directly contradict them, but argue from them in favour of the side you support; thus, when it is said, that by destroying parliament you extinguish Ireland as a nation: It is admitted that Ireland owes its existence as a nation to parliament, and therefore it follows *necessarily* that parliament creates the nation, and not the nation parliament; otherwise when parliament had abdicated its functions, there *would be nothing to prevent the nation*, if it survived, from *choosing another parliament*. Keep this stone in your sleeve for them until the question is again started. Not a word, Sir Boyle Roche has not yet got hold of it.

Another rule which I would lay down for your conduct is one which, perhaps, you may feel some difficulty in prevailing on yourself to follow, but which I have always looked upon in so important a point of view, that I cannot help thinking it ought to be the governing principle of a young member of parliament—whatever you may be offered as a return for your past, or earnest for your future support, do not refuse it; it

will convince the world that you are thought of consequence enough to be worth gaining over, and that you are possessed of virtue enough not to act the knave—without temptation. If you are offered money therefore, pocket it and say no more. If a place, be it ever so small, do not reject it; the name of a place-man gives consequence with the vulgar; besides it is still a step; and should you at any time wish for something higher, you will be sure to find some nobleman who wishes to provide for a superannuated servant, or poor relation, and who will assist in giving you a shove for his own sake.

Attach yourself to some great man; praise him in all companies; and if he is attacked, seem to look upon yourself as his liege-man, bound by *tenure* to defend him against his enemies; this will not fail to come to his ears. In the house take every opportunity of speaking to him; the people in the gallery will remark this intimacy, and will conclude, when he is making some observation on the weather, that he is consulting you about the business of the day; this will not fail to raise you in their estimation. When your patron speaks, be sure to cry “hear”—whenever you observe from his manner that he *thinks* he is saying a good thing; this will have a double effect; it will at once flatter his vanity, and prevent the other side from hearing, and of course from answering what has been said. Should he at any time falter, or be at a loss for a word, be particularly vociferous; this will give him time to recollect himself, and must be wonderfully gratifying, as it will convince him you are disposed to give him credit for a good thing before he utters it. Your parliamentary *bottle-holders* are of infinite use. Should your patron or indeed any other very great man, ask you to dine, be sure not to refuse, but give up every other engagement; you will be amply repaid for the conscious inferiority you will feel there by the superior consequence it will give you with your equals. When in company with the latter talk of Lord C—, Lord B—, as if they were your most intimate companions; and when repeating any thing which you may have overheard one great man say to another, take care to let it be thought that it was particularly addressed to you. If any intended measure of government is talked of, of which you know nothing but from the newspapers, look wise and mysterious—observe that “the accounts in circulation are very erroneous”—that “the thing is not generally known”—that “it is merely whispered at the castle.” And if another ventures to talk on the subject smile at him contemptuously, and shrug your shoulders; by these means you will get credit for all the knowledge of a cabinet counsellor.

There are many other rules which I could lay down for your conduct, but these are enough for the present. By following them implicitly, I have little doubt of your being able to raise yourself in time to that proud situation which I now enjoy—that of

AN OLD HACK.

REVIEW of pictures in the exhibition lately opened in College-green.

No. I. St. George fighting St. Patrick—This is a good painting; the figure of St. Patrick highly spirited, but the attitude of St. George not perfectly correct. The drapery and armour ridiculously modern, and the *costume* absurdly violated; so that St. George has nothing of the champion about him, but the name; the painter has seized the point of time when St. Patrick has had the best of it, and his adversary has retired to *prime*.

No. II. Two groupes, (each 105) vying to get over a *Trench*, which lies between them. A figure strongly resembling R. A—d—ll, Esq; appears to have just accomplished it by a *bounce*.

No. III. A portrait of Lord Castlereagh mourning over the loss of a friend who was convinced in the late debate. He holds in his hand a satire of Horace, set to music, *Hoc erat in votis*; and appears to sing it to a plaintive air. A translation lies on the floor beginning thus—*Shepherds I have lost a vote*.

No. IV. A groupe of Dutch merchants at Japan, purchasing commercial privileges, by trampling upon the cross.

No. V. The companion of the former. The D’oyer Hundred of Cork, signing an Address for the Union. There is much *interest* in these pieces, but very little *spirit*. They evidently are of the same school.

CHEAP DRESSING—suggested to a Lawyer of great WEIGHT, who reminds us of promotion, and the WOOLSACK.

YOUR gown you receiv’d at the Minister’s hands,
‘Cause you strove to supply the whole nation with BANDS.
Buy nought but a wig—for your tongue you so wag,
Attornies and Clients will GIVE YOU THE BAG.

SOLOMON SHAVER

SLAVE TRADE.

TO be sold one hundred and four Negroes, perfectly qualified for *any* servile work. They are of a very fine colour, being jet black from head to foot, as has been pronounced on a late inspection. As they are, however, unsound in constitution, they will be sold cheap. Application to be made to their Master, at Downing-street, or to the Driver, at the corner of the Upper Castle Yard.

N. B. It is expected that they may thrive when removed to any foreign island, as they are observed to have had no attachment to their native country, and therefore it is not to be apprehended that they will pine away after it, as African Slaves do usually.